

# The Philanthropist

PUBLISHED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE OHIO STATE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

AMALIEL BAILEY, Jr., Editor.

We are verily guilty concerning our brother \* \* \* \* \* therefore is this distress come upon us.

SAMUEL A. ALLEY, Printer.

VOLUME I. NO. 33. NEW SERIES.

CINCINNATI, TUESDAY, AUGUST 21, 1838.

WHOLE NO. 132.

**THE PHILANTHROPIST,**  
PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,  
N. W. corner of Main & Sixth streets,  
CINCINNATI, OHIO.

**JAMES BOYLE, Publishing Agent.**  
Terms.—Two Dollars and fifty cents in advance.  
Dollars if not paid till the expiration of the year. Let-  
ters on business should be directed to the Publishing Agent,  
relating to the editorial department, to the Editor.  
Advertisements as usual.

**COMMUNICATIONS.**  
For the Philanthropist,  
**PROFESSOR HODGE ON SLAVERY.**  
NO. III.

Mr. Editor.—An admission of the Pro-  
fessor is in these words: "If any set of men have  
advantages, bond or free, to whom they refuse a pro-  
portionate compensation for their labor, they violate a  
moral duty, and an express command of Scripture."  
To suppose, as Professor Hodge must have had but  
the personal knowledge as to the working of sla-  
very, or its bearing upon this important principle, we  
could naturally suppose that he would desire infor-  
mation from those qualified to afford it, and when  
received, that he would be willing to open his  
eyes to it. Yet it is a fact that he refused to open  
his eyes to a minister of the gospel of high  
standing in Kentucky, who, when he saw the  
mischievous tendency of the publication under re-  
view, prepared a supplement to it, most unexcep-  
tionable in its character, and offered it for publica-  
tion in the Repository, but in vain. It was printed  
in the New York Observer in August, 1836; and  
here it is not that our limits forbid, we might quote  
largely from it that no one could mistake as to  
the fact, that slavery in its operation does destroy,  
as a general rule, the principle in question. Take  
short extract or two as a mere sample.—"There  
is not one in a hundred [of christian slave-masters]  
with whom we have ever become acquainted, who  
seemingly appealed to, could declare that he is  
renouncing an approximation to his duty, or giving  
up any thing like a fair compensation for the  
services rendered by his slaves."—"The slaves  
well know that even their christian masters never  
mean of remunerating them for their services."  
—"Interest, sheer interest regulates their conduct  
towards their bondmen. They regard him as a  
humble whose appropriate use and highest end is  
to subserve their interest."—"We have recently  
known of two ministering brothers selling into the  
enslaved bondage of the far South, the one, two  
hundred, and the other, five thousand dollars' worth  
of slaves. Alas! that truth and duty compel us to  
speak such facts." In Professor Hodge's smooth  
language, it was merely "a transfer of the mas-  
ter's claim," a small affair, of course, in the eyes  
of those whose own children are not in danger of  
such a transfer. But, to the victims what is it  
that alters the case. Nor can such outrages be  
prevented, because they are part and parcel of  
the slave system. But as to the testimony respect-  
ing the compensation for services, let it be remem-  
bered that the region of which is one where sla-  
very exists in its full force—where religion  
exerts an influence greater perhaps than in any  
other portion of the world of equal extent in the  
slave states, and where we might naturally expect  
to find professors who would be particularly care-  
ful not to violate this plain principle of the Bible.  
But no; slavery itself forbids. They hold them  
under a tenure which degrades them property,  
and which says, that "the master may sell them,"  
&c., and that the slave can do nothing, possess  
nothing, nor acquire any thing but which must  
belong to his master." Hence, even good mas-  
ters generally consider that they are bound to do  
nothing but support them; and consequently when  
they present them with a small sum of money at  
Christmas, to make merry with their friends, it is  
always deemed a *gratitude*, and never given to  
them with the understanding that it is paid them  
as wages for their year's service. Now we have  
divine authority for testing the nature of a thing  
by its appropriate results or fruits. And here, we  
receive by the testimony (and we have never  
seen it publicly questioned) that ninety-nine out  
of every hundred, at least in an intelligent and  
christian community, "appropriate to themselves"  
the very language of the witness) the proceeds of  
the slaves' labor, and never dream of remunerat-  
ing them." Is not this state of things produced  
naturally by slavery? It unquestionably grows  
out of it as truly as the oak springs from the acorn.  
Can any one deny it, we put to him this question,  
can you name any other institution "sanctioned  
by Scripture" which is so abused, under the light  
of the present day, as to lead almost all christians,  
of any large community who observe it, to live in  
a palpable and habitual violation of one of the  
plainest principles and precepts in God's holy  
Word? If you can show such a case, then we  
may be induced to believe that the state of things  
mentioned above is only an abuse of slavery; but  
if it takes place where we must be excused for view-  
ing it as the genuine offspring of this monster, as  
it must call it, though it be now clothed in the  
garb of religion, and presents itself before us claim-  
ing companionship with the sons of God.

The general tendency of Professor Hodge's  
view of the subject of Slavery, constitutes one  
of the worst features. And this arises from the  
fact that he attempted to discuss a mere imaginary  
system of slavery,—one which exists nowhere  
in his own mind. Are we not chiefly inter-  
ested in the slavery of this country? Why then  
should we avert our eyes from it, as it exists in  
fact and practice, to follow a chimera of the brain?  
There can be no doubt but that he lays down such  
principles incidentally, and makes such admissions  
as will, if fairly carried out, destroy the slavery  
of this land. This arises from the fact, that a  
man of an expanded mind and christian heart, cannot  
be long in the way of error without some bursts  
of truth escaping him; and these are just so many  
advantages, noticed by the unprejudiced ob-  
server. But the main object of the work is main-  
tained, to prove that slave-holding is sanctioned  
by Scripture. Hence the anxiety of many to cir-  
cumvent it, and their readiness to laud it, although  
its principles condemn their own con-  
duct throughout. Professor Hodge  
attempts to discuss slavery as he thinks it might  
exist,—though it never did thus exist,—but  
from an investigation of the slavery of  
this country, we are confident that the hue and cry  
against abolitionists, arises chiefly from the  
fact that the mass of the people have no defined  
or intelligent view of the subject of slavery in  
this country. Hence we ask attention to  
this clear and simple definition of it, taken

from a speech of the Rev. Robert J. Breckenridge,  
whose knowledge of the subject is unquestioned,  
and who certainly has no prejudices in favor of  
abolitionists. He asks, *what is slavery in this  
land?* and then says, "We reply, it is that condi-  
tion enforced by the laws of one-half of the states  
of this confederacy, in which one portion of the  
community, called masters, is allowed such power  
over another portion called slaves; as

"1. To deprive them of the entire earnings of  
their labor, except only so much as is necessary  
to continue labor itself by continuing healthful ex-  
istence; thus committing clear robbery;

"2. To reduce them to the necessity of univer-  
sal concubinage, by denying to them the civil right  
of marriage; thus breaking up the dearest rela-  
tions of life and encouraging universal prostitu-  
tion;

"3. To deprive them of the means and opportu-  
nities of moral and intellectual culture,—in many  
states making it a high penal offence to teach them  
to read; thus perpetuating whatever of evil there  
is that proceeds from ignorance;

"4. To set up between parents and their chil-  
dren an authority higher than the impulse of na-  
ture and the laws of God; which breaks up the  
authority of the father over his own offspring, and,  
at pleasure, separates the mother at a returnless  
distance from her child; thus abrogating the clearest  
laws of nature; thus outraging all decency and  
justice, and degrading and oppressing thousands  
of beings created like themselves in the image of  
the most high God!

"This is slavery, as it is exhibited daily in  
every slave state."

The definition is correct—the delineation most  
appalling. Professor Hodge himself would lift  
up both hands against this iniquity; and yet he  
writes an article well calculated to prop up this  
very system, and so construed by the slave-holders  
themselves, who desire and pray that they may  
be let alone in their sin. How appropriate the in-  
scription of a minister of the gospel from Ken-  
tucky, placed upon it, when in the General As-  
sembly at Pittsburgh! It was put into his hands,  
and after examination, he wrote on it—"A Plea  
for Oppression." Very soon afterwards the in-  
scription was observed by a brother, who, to show  
his indignation against the offender, called the at-  
tention of the minister from Kentucky to it, by  
saying—"See, what some Abolitionist has done!"  
It is truly a plea for oppression, and well calcu-  
lated to prolong it in our land. Alas! that it should  
have emanated from such a distinguished Professor  
in our highest school of the prophets.

We close with a few miscellaneous remarks.  
1. Professor Hodge's view of that ingredient in  
slavery which makes it *hereditary*, is most cer-  
tainly too contracted. The foundation of it, he  
hides entirely from view. We must try therefore  
to supply the deficiency. It rests altogether on  
this delicate phrase—"partus sequitur ventrem,"  
literally, *the birth follows the belly*. Meaning  
thereby that the condition of the child must be the  
same as that of the mother, leaving the father, of  
course, out of the question. Now this is what I  
call a *heavenly maxim*; and why? Because it is  
the very principle which regulates property in the  
brute creation, in this particular. The owner of a  
brood mare claims her colts as his own, without op-  
position from the owner of the colt's sire. Just so  
with the owner of female slaves. Is not this  
degrading to humanity? And what is more, it di-  
rectly violates that command of the inspired pen-  
man to fathers, "Bring up your children in the  
nurture and admonition of the Lord." The fun-  
damental principle of hereditary slavery forbids it,  
and what is remarkable, nearly all the human  
beings now claimed by masters in this Union as  
property, are held on this unscriptural and unright-  
eous principle. They are slaves by birth, or rather  
because their mothers were held as slaves. Now  
be it observed, that Professor Hodge freely  
concedes one of the grand principles of abolition-  
ists; viz. that if slavery is sinful, it ought to be  
immediately abandoned. He says, "this reason-  
ing is perfectly conclusive." And, of course,  
if any ingredient or adjunct of slavery is sinful,  
that ought also to cease immediately. This position  
he will not deny. It follows then, on his own  
principles, that as the assumed rights to masters  
to almost all the slaves in America, rests on the  
maxim—"partus sequitur ventrem"; and as this  
maxim clearly violates the Divine maxim for the  
regulation and government of families, these slaves  
by birth, ought all to be set free at once. Will  
Professor Hodge be consistent enough to join in a  
christian appeal to the masters of this largest class  
of slaves, to this effect? If not, can we possibly  
believe his assertion, that he "sincerely desires  
the extinction of slavery as any of the abolition-  
ists?" The emancipation of all that are held on the  
hereditary principle, would be the death blow  
of the system.

2. Professor Hodge's assertion, that the violence  
and angry excitement in the South were caused by  
the abolition discussions, &c., is in my view erro-  
neous. These discussions were the occasion, not  
the cause. That lay in their love of "Southern  
institutions," and their determination to hear  
nothing against them. As well might he have in-  
sisted that the preaching of Paul caused all the  
mobs and violent outrages that we read of as tak-  
ing place in Syria and Judea, in connection with  
his labors. The writer met not long since, in Vir-  
ginia, with an intelligent gentleman from Tennes-  
see, whose conversation furnished him with a  
more philosophical account of the matter. He was  
asked to account for the degree of angry passion  
that prevailed among so many in the South. He  
replied that it was owing to the writings, speeches,  
&c., of the abolitionists. Well, but why get mad  
at these? Masters have the slaves present with  
them—they can give as much information as they  
please to them, and all favorable to their own views.  
And so far as it is necessary to produce general  
effect, let them speak and print also, and thus meet  
the abolitionists, and fairly defeat them if they can.  
Oh! said he, with a look of surprise, that would  
never do. Why not? "Because the arguments  
of the abolitionists are stronger than ours." Then,  
I remarked, the whole matter is explained; for it  
is a fact, that if men are defeated in argument and  
are still resolved not to be convinced, they will  
get angry. It is human nature. This gentleman  
was a member of the Baptist church, apparently  
a very pious man; and what has been related of  
him is strictly true. The improper harshness of  
some abolitionists was a mere circumstance in this  
matter. The slaveholders generally acknowl-

ed that slavery is sinful, and the abolitionists draw  
the inference which is now acknowledged to be  
correct, viz. that immediate abandonment of every  
thing sinful is our duty, and called loudly on them  
to put their own principles into practice. Hence  
the struggle in their mind and their present posi-  
tion. That Northern denunciation, as it is called,  
is insufficient to account for it, it is plainly to be  
seen in the burning of Mr. Breckenridge's Maga-  
zine, in Virginia. It was a Southern print, con-  
tained no abusive language, yet it was publicly  
burnt by the functionaries of a large town, on the  
ground that it called in question what Professor  
Hodge denominates a "mere technicality," or legal  
fiction, viz. the assumed right of property in  
man. It is a most potent fiction in its consequen-  
ces, alas! sweeping as with the besom of destruc-  
tion, the rights and hopes of two and a half mil-  
lions of our fellow creatures. Yet the South,  
finding it much easier to burn arguments than to  
answer them, permit pride and passion to usurp the  
seat of reason, and hence the excitement. But  
they must take time to cool again, for those who  
engage in this caused from principle will not be  
brow-beaten into silence. But why does Professor  
Hodge wait over the fact, that we now "hear  
from the South the language of justification," and  
that a public feeling is rising in the North "in  
favor of slavery itself"? Did he not pen his article  
for the express purpose of showing that "slavery  
itself is not sinful," but that it is "sanctioned by  
Scripture"? Why blame the South for justifying  
a Bible institution, or lament over the North begin-  
ning to agree with the Professor himself? If his  
doctrine be true, what was the old profession but  
"speaking lies in hypocrisy"? And is it not to be  
rejoiced at, that truth begins to take the place of  
error? If this be not gross inconsistency in the  
Professor, we know not where to find it. For  
our own part, we view these symptoms as mere  
writings under the lash of truth, and consider  
them more favorable by far than the long calm that  
preceeded, and under whose influence slavery  
(while all acknowledged its turpitude,) extended  
its branches so widely over us, and struck its roots  
so deeply into our soil.

3. We have recently seen an argument pre-  
sented with a considerable degree of confidence,  
in opposition to the position that "Slavery is sinful."  
It is this. There are several human beings now  
held as slaves, some of whom are aged and infirm,  
others are idiots, &c.—Consequently they could  
not provide for themselves; so that to give them  
freedom would be to them a great injury, &c.  
Now in answer to this, we allege that if any mas-  
ter should choose to support the system no longer,  
and should manumit the infirm with the healthy,  
there is no law forbidding him to support such  
as well as he would have done when keeping them  
as slaves. And as to the danger of being sold  
by the state, the argument makes their condition  
such that no one would purchase them. But we  
have another answer that will meet all these ex-  
treme cases. There is such a thing as breaking  
the letter of the law without violating its spirit.  
Our Saviour teaches (Mark ii, 26) that David did  
not sin, although he broke the law of God, in eat-  
ing the shew-bread. Hunger impelled him to the  
act, and we know that "necessity knows no law."  
Just so in the other case, even if we grant the  
position of the objector. It is a case of dire ne-  
cessity, in that view of it, and does not destroy  
the principle that slavery is sinful; for it is merely  
an exception to the rule, and we are all acquainted  
with the established maxim, "exceptio firmat  
regulam," an exception strengthens or confirms the  
rule. Robbery or stealing is sinful. Yet there  
are extreme cases when taking another man's prop-  
erty, without his consent, or robbing him of it,  
is justifiable by the laws of God and man. So  
much for this cavil.

Finally, The assertion that Christ does not con-  
demn slavery, rests wholly on the ground that it  
is not sufficient to give principles, which, if honestly  
carried out, would entirely prevent the "evil" from  
taking place, or destroy it wherever found. That  
each particular sin must be specified, otherwise the  
act is sanctioned by Scripture! Had this course  
been pursued by sacred writers, the Bible would  
have been truly formidable as to size. Is not a  
tree as effectually prostrated by digging up  
the roots, as by lopping off the branches, and cutting  
it down by piecemeal? The argument however  
proves too much, and is therefore good for nothing.  
Did not Paul illustrate his subject by allusion  
to the practices at the Grecian games without  
condemning those practices by name? Are they there-  
fore sanctioned by Scripture? Did not gambling  
exist in Christ's day? Yet was he silent of the  
subject. Must we consequently be silent also, or  
be accused of arrogating to ourselves more wis-  
dom than the Son of God? Can any one show  
that he ever spoke a word in favor either of sla-  
very or gambling? It is a fact, almost universally  
admitted, that the *whole tenor and spirit of the  
Word of God* is opposed to slavery. Nay, this  
truth is so obvious, that it sometimes escapes even  
from those that attempt to establish the contrary.  
Hence Professor Hodge says, that "adopting those  
principles which the Bible enjoins, tends to pro-  
duce universal intelligence, virtue, liberty and  
equality." How preposterous, then, to construe  
the supposed silence of Christ, or interpret any  
particular text so as to contradict, or clash with,  
the general bearing of holy writ. The laws of  
interpretation demand that each portion shall cor-  
respond with the scope of the whole. Does not  
the General Assembly of our church pronounce  
slavery to be "totally irreconcilable with the  
spirit and principles of the Gospel of Christ"?  
And they assert, that "it is manifestly the duty  
of all christians, as speedily as possible, to effect  
this blot on our holy religion, and to obtain the  
complete abolition of slavery throughout Chris-  
tendom, and if possible throughout the world."  
To this we say Amen.

AQUILA.

For the Philanthropist,  
**TENDENCIES OF DEMOCRACY.**

Mr. Editor.—Your article in the Philanthro-  
pist of the 24th of July, concerning the "Tenden-  
cies to Democracy," encourages me to send for  
publication some of my thoughts on the same, or a  
corresponding subject. You say—"We began  
well"; because "the Bible was read and revered  
everywhere, and its principles constituted the basis  
of our political institutions." "What has followed?"  
Our tendencies to democracy have been constantly  
associated with tendencies to mobocracy. While  
the sovereignty of the people has been magnified  
beyond all limits, the sacredness of personal rights  
has ceased to be a great practical maxim in the  
mind of the public. We know, and the world knows,  
that the American people are now peculiarly ir-  
religious, disorderly, devoid of a generous and an in-  
telligent attachment to freedom, and amazingly re-

gardless of personal rights." Hence I understand  
you to mean, that our civil government was formed  
to protect personal rights, and was based on the  
authority of the Bible; and that in so far as the  
people have advanced towards democracy, they  
have departed from the Constitution of the United  
States. In these views I agree with you entirely;  
and I suspect it will be our fate to be regarded as  
fools and fanatics, and traitors to the sovereign ma-  
jesty of the people.

In confirmation of the views above given, let us  
notice two or three extracts from Judge Fox's late  
charge to the Grand Jury, as published in the Nor-  
ristown Herald. He says,—

"An extraordinary disposition to set at naught the law,  
and the legal power of its officers, exists throughout our country,  
from one extremity to the other."

Again he says:—

"But when, in the present case, all barriers are broken  
down, and the power of the law is prostituted by the con-  
nivance and countenance of all ages, ranks and conditions, we  
must fear that the disease has reached the vitals of society;  
and unless prompt and effectual remedies are applied, a speedy  
and violent dissolution must take place."

After noticing certain apologies urged in behalf  
of the mobs, he adds,—

"Such excuses for such acts, are in effect but avowals that  
the law shall be suspended, and the mob govern, wherever  
the majority, or those who have the power, whether a majority  
or not, shall choose that it be so."

Now, Mr. Editor, what shall we say to these  
things? Editors of our periodicals are brought to  
a stand; judges of our courts are at their wit's end;  
and senators in congress cannot tell what is the  
matter with the nation. Be assured, sir, that truth  
will never be productive of evil consequences. It is  
a delusion that has produced this disease in the  
public mind. With what soothing and self-flattery  
have we been taking for granted that the people are  
the source of power; that they possess by nature a  
sovereign majesty; and that they have an inherent  
and indefeasible right to self-government. The  
more I reflect on these dogmas, the more am I  
convinced that they cannot bear examination.—  
They are so far from being self-evident truths, that,  
in my opinion, they are blasphemous falsehoods.—  
Who but God himself has an inherent right to  
self-government? Who but the Creator of all  
things is the source of power? Who else pos-  
sesses by nature a sovereign majesty? If a king  
shall pretend to this high supremacy, we make a  
great outcry against the blasphemy of his claim;  
but what better right has a mob than a king to as-  
sume and exercise irresponsible dominion? The  
people have no better claim to the glories of su-  
preme authority than a king, or a nobility; and such  
an assumption is equally vain and groundless, whether  
made by a minority, or a majority of man-kind.

That this claim is made by the mobocracy of  
our country, I prove by the following extract from  
the Philadelphia Freeman, Extra, of "Philadel-  
phia, fifth day, fifth month 24: 1838."

"A correspondent of the Daily Freeman, comes boldly out in  
favor of Lynch law—asserting that a mob is a necessary  
element of civil government, and concludes with the fol-  
lowing—'But there was a law that authorized the destruction  
of the tyrannical abolitionists. The law was made on the  
spot;—the very act itself was law. The people, who are the  
ultimate foundation of all power in the commonwealth,  
were there in person, and in majesty—they at  
once, and on the emergency, legislated, judged, condemned,  
and executed. Besides, this, these mobs will go to convince  
the South and the world that the bone and sinew of Pen-  
sylvania yeomanry are true to them and to the Union.'"

Now, Mr. Editor, are abolitionists astonished at  
the avowal of such sentiments as these? They are  
the natural and unavoidable consequences of those  
favorite maxims which abolitionists celebrate in  
common with mobocrats. For if it be true, that  
the people are "the ultimate foundation of all power,"  
that they possess a sovereign majesty, and  
have the inherent right of self-government, it fol-  
lows indubitably that they have a right, upon every  
"emergency," to make law for themselves, and to  
execute the law at the same time that it is "enacted."  
Who shall presume to control a sovereign  
majesty, that has the inherent right of self-gov-  
ernment? If these favorite maxims of America be  
admitted as first principles, it is undeniable that  
lynch law and mob violence are nothing more than  
a legitimate exercise of indisputable power, on the  
part of the sovereign people. If the above maxims  
be true, the people have as good a right to exercise  
this power, as God ever had to create the hea-  
vens and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land.

That this favorite hypothesis, concerning the  
right of self-government, is at war with the su-  
preme authority of Almighty God, will appear by  
the following quotation from "Ethan Smith's Dis-  
sertation on the Prophecies," published in Boston,  
1814.

"Revolutionary France, by national authority, not only  
denied the christian religion, but the existence of God. A  
pledge was written by Anarchists Clouts, a member of their  
National Convention, and the reporter of their committee,  
and was accepted by the convention, and printed and circu-  
lated by their order, in which are the following sentiments:—  
'Man, when free, wants no other deity than himself—  
Reason dethrones both the kings of the earth, and the King  
of Heaven. No monarchy above, if we wish to preserve our  
republic below. Volumes have been written to determine  
whether a republic of atheists could exist. I maintain that  
every other republic is a chimera. If you admit the exist-  
ence of a heavenly sovereign, you introduce the wooden  
horse within your walls; what you adore by day, will be  
your destruction by night.' This infidel powder decreed that  
the promiscuous intercourse of the sexes is no crime. They  
fixed the inscription in their burying ground, 'Death is an  
eternal sleep.' Mr. Smith gives his quotation from 'Bain-  
well's Memoirs, vol. ii, p. 245.'"

Now, sir, are you astonished at the avowal of  
these sentiments? They are the legitimate off-  
spring of American democracy. For if the people  
are "the ultimate foundation of all power"—if  
they possess "sovereign majesty"—and have "an in-  
herent and indefeasible right to self-gov-  
ernment."—it is obvious as the light of day, either that  
no God exists, or that He has no right of control  
whatever over the majesty and inherent power  
of the people.

"During the French revolution," says Mr. Smith, "a co-  
median, dressed as a priest of the Illuminati, publicly ap-  
peared, and personally attacking the Almighty, said,—'No,  
thou dost not exist! If thou hast power over the thunder,  
bolts, grasp them; aim them at the man who dares set thee  
at defiance, in the face of thy illurs. But no! I blas-  
pheme thee, and I still live. No, thou dost not exist.'"  
Smith's Dissertations, p. 147.

Are these bold positions? They are not more  
bold, nor more false, nor more indefensible, than  
the favorite maxims above specified. These maxims  
I believe to be falsehoods which have a most  
pernicious tendency against the best interests of  
the whole human race. There is no being in exist-  
ence but God alone, who has an inherent right to  
self-government. No other being is clothed with  
sovereign majesty; and He alone is the source,  
and the ultimate foundation of power. The claim  
of popular authority in this country, as well as in  
France, is obviously a contention with the Lord

God Almighty, for the prerogative of supreme do-  
minion.

Democracy and mobocracy are the same in prin-  
ciple, and in all their tendencies. They claim to  
be independent of all other authority, to be irre-  
sponsible in the exercise of their power, and that  
they have the right to make laws for themselves,  
as they progress in their sovereign operations.

The people, it is said, have an undoubted right  
to govern themselves. That is; to make what laws  
they please, and then to regulate their actions ac-  
cording to those laws. But who are the people?  
The secret and hidden meaning of this favorite  
maxim is, that the people are the majority, and  
the majority are the people; but it is an obvious  
dictate of common sense, that self-government es-  
sentially implies that those only who vote for a  
measure, or a law, are to be governed by it. The  
minority, who did not vote for it, are not to be  
governed by it; for this would be very different  
from self-government: it would be the authorita-  
tive act of a part of the community, governing  
other people against their consent. From what  
argument can it be made to appear, that such power  
resides in a majority of the people? Who gave  
the majority this dominion? If they renounce God  
and the Bible, let them tell us from what source,  
or law of nature, they have derived their authority.  
And if they appeal to the Bible, we are prepared  
to show from its sacred pages, that personal rights  
are the foundation of civil government; and that  
these rights, as they exist in every individual, are  
protected by the authority of man's Eternal Creator.  
He is the supreme Ruler; and every pre-  
tence of sovereign power, independent of this, is  
the precise and identical claim of the devil and his  
angels.

If it be true that a majority have power to make  
what laws they please for the government of the  
minority, it is undeniable that American slavery is  
right; for the system of slavery was established by  
a majority of the people of the South; and conse-  
quently, its establishment and perpetuity result from  
the indisputable action of the sovereign people.—  
The same power could enslave the children of  
white people, for equally good reasons, and by an  
exercise of the same popular authority.

It is my settled conviction, that these celebrated  
maxims—THE PEOPLE ARE THE SOURCE OF POWER,  
AND THEY POSSESS THE INHERENT RIGHT OF SELF-  
GOVERNMENT,—are the main pillars of all the lynch  
law of the south, and all the mob violence of the  
north; and that AMERICAN DEMOCRACY embodies a  
deeper scheme of wickedness, and is a greater evil  
to this nation, and to the world, than the entire  
system of AMERICAN SLAVERY. If all the negroes  
and all other people were now free, let DEMOCRACY  
live and flourish, and in less than half a century,  
it would reduce the world to a state of slavery again.  
These things are not said at random. This subject  
I have fully matured, and am well aware of the  
consequences of an avowal of such sentiments.—  
If the public should be aroused to inquire into this  
matter, as into that of emancipation, it would re-  
inforce the amount of mob violence excited, that  
you have ever seen excited against the anti-slavery  
enterprise. But let not these things move us, and  
let us not account our lives dear unto ourselves; for,  
to bear a dying testimony against this destructive  
scheme of atheism, would, in my opinion, be the  
highest honor and happiness to be enjoyed on this  
side the paradise of God.

I entreat you, Mr. Editor, by all that is honor-  
able to heaven, and dear to humanity, to continue  
your meditations on this subject with great atten-  
tion and perseverance; and let it be known that  
one press in our country is conducted with suffi-  
cient moral courage to expose the most popular sys-  
tem of delusion that ever prevailed in this or any  
other nation. You may oppose slavery as long  
and as earnestly as you please; but if I be not  
greatly mistaken, while the people sleep over the  
deep and ruinous maxims and passions of atheistic  
democracy, nothing will be effectually done, either  
for the emancipation of the slaves, or for the pre-  
servation of this community from one of the most  
terrible convulsions that ever afflicted the guilty  
and deluded family of man. Unless the people  
can be brought to acknowledge the truth, that they  
are dependent on God for every thing; that they  
have no power but what is His gift, and for the ex-  
ercise of which they are accountable to the Giver,  
we may expect national pride to swell, and popular  
phrenzy to rage, till the self-government of North  
America shall correspond exactly with the self-gov-  
ernment of the French republic, in the closing part  
of the last century.

Yours, &c. A. SHINN.

The following Address, delivered at a meet-  
ing of the Female Anti-Slavery Society of Cincin-  
nati, by Dr. ALLEY, is published by the request of  
the members of the Society.—ED. PHIL.

**AN ADDRESS.**

LADIES:—

If he who has the honor to address you on this  
occasion had been actuated by motives of prudence,  
so called, he certainly would not thus have exposed  
himself. He is fully aware that neither his profes-  
sional interests, nor the good opinion of his fellow  
citizens generally, will at present be promoted  
thereby. He is nevertheless persuaded that prin-  
ciple is the safest and most satisfactory rule of his  
actions; and while he prizes the approbation of his  
fellow men, and yields to them the inalienable  
privilege of thinking, speaking, writing, and acting  
for themselves, with due regard to the common  
good, he is not disposed to surrender his own  
rights, from motives of *niere* expediency.

The cause which we this evening meet to advo-  
cate and promote, is one that has for many years  
engaged his best affections, and the convictions of  
his understanding have coincided with the feelings  
of his heart.

Slavery, or the involuntary privation of the un-  
forfeited liberty, happiness, and life of one portion  
of the human family by the policy or power of an-  
other portion, is a condition of things, as my re-  
spected audience might know, altogether at vari-  
ance with the benign principles of christianity, and  
even with refined moral sense. No modification  
of this enormous evil can take from it the iniquity  
and deformity of its character. Disguised as it  
may be by the sophistries and subtleties of interest-  
ed men, the bitterness of slavery remains the  
same; against it is levelled the whole artillery of the  
Divine Decalogue, the sun and substance of which  
is, man's supreme love to God, and mutual charity  
to man.

Against slavery, many holders of their fellow  
men in bondage have decidedly and feelingly ut-  
tered their testimony. Chief among them, we are  
happy to enroll the ever-venerated and loved name  
of our common political father,—WASHINGTON.  
Permit your speaker to offer a few extracts from

that patriot's letters on the subject, as published by  
Jared Sparks, Esq.

In a letter to Robert Morris, he thus expresses  
himself:—

"I hope it will not be conceived from these observations,  
that it is my wish to hold the unhappy people, who are the  
subject of this letter, in slavery. I can only say, that there  
is not a man living who wishes more sincerely than I do, to  
see a plan adopted for the abolition of it; but there is only  
one proper and effectual mode by which it can be accom-  
plished, and that is, by the legislative authority; and this, as  
far as my suffrage will go, shall not be wanting."

To La Fayette he writes:—

"The benevolence of your heart, my dear Marquis, is ap-  
parent on all occasions, that I never wonder at freed  
people of it, but your late purchase of the estate in the colony  
of Cayenne, with a view of emancipating the slaves, is a ge-  
nerous and noble proof of your humanity. Would to God  
a like spirit might diffuse itself generally into the minds of the  
people of this country! But I despair of seeing it. Some  
petitions were presented to the Assembly at its last session,  
for the abolition of slavery, but they could scarcely obtain a  
hearing."

To John F. Mercer, the following are his senti-  
ments:—

"I never mean, unless some particular circumstance should  
compel me to it, to possess another slave by purchase. It  
being among my first wishes to see some plan adopted, by  
which slavery in this country may be abolished by law."

In a letter to Sir John Sinclair, among his reasons  
for depreciation of southern lands, he writes:

"Blessed be the God who has given us the gradual  
abolition of slavery, which neither Maryland nor Virginia  
have at present; but which nothing is more certain than that  
they must have, and at a period not remote."

Your speaker asks permission to add an extract  
from Washington's Will, July 9th, 1790.

"Upon the decease of my wife, it is my will and desire that  
all my slaves which I hold in my own right, shall receive  
their freedom. To emancipate them during her life, would,  
though earnestly wished, be attended with such insuperable  
difficulties, on account of their intermixture by marriages with  
the white negroes, as to create the most fearful sentiment, if  
not disagreeable consequences from the latter, while both de-  
scendants are in the occupancy of the same proprietor; it not  
being in my power, under the tenure by which the white ne-  
groes are held, to manumit them."

In all the preceding extracts, we behold, as in a  
mirror, the combination of benevolence and prudence,  
for which that matchless man was pre-emi-  
nent.

As the ushering into the world of the glorious dis-  
pensation of the gospel, in the incarnation of Di-  
vine Truth and Love, the angelic anthem that saluted  
the enraptured ears and hearts of the shepherds,  
was—"Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace,  
good will towards men." Its sound is gone forth;  
still does it reverberate, sweetly to some, discordantly to  
others. "All have heard, but all have not obeyed."

By us, it is hoped, the fulness of its blessings is  
measurably appreciated, and amidst our numerous  
discouragements, we lay hold on the promises of  
support and consolation. Yes, in proportion to  
our devotedness and labor of love, do we enjoy a  
present reward, in that tranquility of mind ever at-  
tendant on the faithful performance of duty.

In our efforts to meliorate the condition of our  
African brethren, it may with truth be said that  
with very few exceptions, considering the magnitude  
of our cause, we have, as much as in us lay,  
endeavored to "be at peace with all men." But  
the sacred records, and the experience of all ages,  
show, that every moral reformation was introduced  
when mankind were least prepared in heart for it,  
and had to conflict with general prejudice, self-in-  
terest, ignorance, tradition, and love of dominion.  
They who were raised up and qualified as agents  
of reform, have uniformly been misrepresented,  
maligned, persecuted, and even sometimes slain,  
by communities whose best interests, for time and  
eternity, were being promoted, by the innocent but  
faithful objects of their "envy, hatred, malice, and  
uncharitableness;" because they felt it their duty  
to designate, by their real names, the reigning evils,  
and to testify impartially against them. Prophets  
and apostles, "of whom the world was not worth-  
y," were rejected, stoned to death; sawn asunder,  
and subjected to various other torments; they had  
to seek preservation in dens and caves of the  
earth. But, above all, the Prince of Peace, the  
Lamb of God, the very personification of Divine  
Wisdom, Imogeneity, and Benevolence, suffered,  
as you well know, every indignity, and died the  
ignominious and cruel death of the cross, as a mal-  
factor, at the hands of those whom he came to save.

It ought not, therefore, to be considered strange,  
that similar, though vastly inferior, benefactions in  
our day, should meet with scornful, injurious, and  
even murderous opposition, by "wicked and un-  
reasonable men." And while we admit that there  
is nothing desirable or worthy of being courted, in  
our life sufferings here specified, yet let us not  
flatter ourselves that we shall escape them alto-  
gether, while striving, by the influence of moral  
suasion, as is our constitutional right, and by  
personal example, to imbecitate and perpetuate this  
law of justice, mercy, and truth—"Whatsoever  
ye would that men should do unto you, do ye  
even so unto them."

We do not doubt, that a candid, dispassionate  
examination of our sentiments and efforts as aboli-  
tionists, cannot fail to convince our fellow citizens  
of the South, and those who are associated in feel-  
ing with them, that we never have presumed, even  
in thought, to make use of physical force our-  
selves, or to encourage it in others, for the estab-  
lishment of our cause, or to interfere with legisla-  
tion or other acknowledged rights; but that, in the  
spirit of non-resistance, in truth and sincerity, our  
principles and practice are, to endeavor to affect  
public sentiment by free discussion and rational ar-  
gument, trusting in the eventual omnipotence of  
truth.

But we are repeatedly told that the discussion  
of the subject of slavery is fraught with danger;  
that it is likely to introduce disorder into the  
commonwealth, and even to occasion the dissolution  
of our Federal Union.

By whom, my highly respected hearers, are  
these objections alleged? In the first place, by a  
class of men who have no real apprehension of these  
consequences; but whose avarice, or love of  
luxurious ease, disqualifies them to relinquish sla-  
very; and in order to remain undisturbed in their  
possessions; sound the threat of "dissolution of the  
Union," whenever they think proper; but are  
really among the first who deprecate a *dissolution*,  
well knowing the calamitous consequences to them-  
selves.

They also foresee that the result of fair and hon-  
orable discussion is unfavorable to their cause; so  
that, not being able thus to justify themselves, they  
are compelled to take refuge under the pretext of  
danger to the Union.

Such men are too palpably disqualified to give  
an unbiased sentiment on the subject; they stake  
their lives in it induces them strenuously







10 to 11  
9 to 10 lb.



